

# Reply to “the Comment on ‘Modified Scalar-Tensor-Vector Gravity Theory and the Constraint on its Parameters’ ”

Xue-Mei Deng<sup>1,\*</sup> Yi Xie<sup>2,†</sup> and Tian-Yi Huang<sup>2,3‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Purple Mountain Observatory, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Nanjing 210008, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Astronomy, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Shanghai Astronomical Observatory,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai 200030, China*

(Dated: May 14, 2009)

## Abstract

J. W. Moffat and V. T. Toth submitted recently a comment [1] on our latest paper “Modified scalar-tensor-vector gravity theory and the constraint on its parameters” [2]. We reply to each of their comments and justify our work and conclusions. Especially, their general STVG (MOG) theory has to be modified to fit the modern precision experiments.

PACS numbers: 04.50.-h, 04.25.Nx, 04.80.Cc

---

\*Electronic address: xue.mei.deng.x@gmail.com

†Electronic address: yixie@nju.edu.cn

‡Electronic address: tyhuang@nju.edu.cn

In the following we will abbreviate the comment paper of J. W. Moffat and V. T. Toth [1] as MT and our paper [2] as DXH. We will give point-by-point response to their comments, but may change the order of the comments in their article.

(1) On the violation of equivalence principle.

Under the condition that the charge of the fifth force is proportional to its gravitational mass, STVG and MSTVG satisfy only the *Weak Equivalence Principle* (WEP) but not the *Einstein Equivalence Principle* (EEP). The reason is that the vector field  $\phi_\mu$  appears in the action of matter  $\mathcal{S}_M$  besides the matter and the metric (see Eq.(8) in DXH), then the motion of test particles move not only under the geometry of the curved space-time. In our paper we stressed that STVG and MSTVG violate EEP but have never said they violate WEP.

(2) On the so called effective gravitational constant.

In post-Newtonian expansion of the solution of the field equations, an effective gravitational constant takes the place of the Newtonian constant in Poisson's equation in the Newtonian limit [3, 4, 5, 6]. In our approach, the effective gravitational constant is that  $\mathcal{G} = \frac{2}{1+\gamma}G_0$  for MSTVG (see Eqs. (37) and (40) in [2]), where  $G_0$  is the *bare* gravitational constant. In other words, the metric component  $g_{00}$  at  $\mathcal{O}(1/c^2)$  is irrelative to the vector field.

But we do obtain MT's effective gravitational constant from the motion equation at the Newtonian order. Here we rewrite Eq.(71) in DXH as follows

$$\ddot{x}^i = -\frac{\mathcal{G}M}{r^3}x^i \left[ 1 + \alpha \left( 1 + \frac{r}{\lambda} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{r}{\lambda} \right) \right] + \mathcal{O}(2). \quad (1)$$

If the items within the square brackets are absorbed into the gravitational constants we nearly get  $G_{eff}$  of MT. This discussion actually justifies our post-Newtonian approach. On the other hand we see now that the  $G_{eff}$  obtained from the Newtonian equation of motion is not consistent with the effective gravitational constant in Poisson equation.

We do not understand why MT said our effective gravitational constant is  $G_N(1+\alpha)$ . In DXH, it is clearly represented in Eqs.(35) and (40).

(3) On the value of  $\gamma$  for STVG.

Actually this is the key argument between MT and us. MT wrote "Their argument is based on a Parameterized Post-Newtonian [4] representation of STVG, which they derive in Appendix B of their paper by explicitly ignoring the MOG vector field:  $\dots$ ".

We wish MT had carefully read our paper. The conclusion of  $\gamma = 1/3$  is obtained in the

context and its detailed derivation is in Appendix A. In Appendix A we did not ignore the vector field although the vector field has no contribution to the determination of  $\gamma$  in our approach.

The purpose of Appendix B is to find the values of other PPN parameters. Because the PPN formalism is restricted within the gravitational theories which follow EEP [3] but STVG and MSTVG violate EEP, the inclusion of the vector field will produce some superpotentials that are not included in the PPN formalism. This fact makes us to drop the vector field in Appendix B. The inclusion of the vector field will not change the fact that  $\gamma = 1/3$  for STVG.

(4) On  $G \simeq \text{constant}$  and  $-g_{00} \simeq g_{rr}^{-1}$ .

$G \simeq \text{const.}$  and  $-g_{00} \simeq g_{rr}^{-1}$  (which denotes  $B(r) = A^{-1}(r)$  in [2]) are used in [7, 8]. In Appendix A of DXH we show that  $\gamma = 1$  when  $G = \text{constant}$  but otherwise  $\gamma = 1/3$ . Consequently, the sub-family of STVG when  $G = \text{constant}$  can fit the present experiments.

It is well known that  $-g_{00} = g_{rr}^{-1}$  means  $\gamma = 1$  [3]. For STVG  $-g_{00} = g_{rr}^{-1}$  does not hold generally. In [7, 8] it is used with  $G = \text{constant}$  together then it becomes allowable.

What we considered in DXH is the general STVG theory but not its special case of  $G = \text{constant}$ . Then  $\gamma$  is equal to  $1/3$  and STVG has to be revised to fit the present space experiments.

- 
- [1] J. W. Moffat and V. T. Toth, arXiv:0903.5291 (2009).
  - [2] X.-M. Deng, Y. Xie and T.-Y. Huang, Phys. Rev. D. **79**, 044014 (2009).
  - [3] C. M. Will, *Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1993).
  - [4] Y. Nutku, Astrophys. J. **155**, 999 (1969).
  - [5] B. Z. Foster and T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 064015 (2006).
  - [6] Y. Xie and T.-Y. Huang, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 124049 (2008).
  - [7] J. W. Moffat, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics **03**, 004 (2006).
  - [8] J. W. Moffat and V. T. Toth, Class. Quant. Grav. **26**, 085002 (2009).